



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/838,806	04/20/2001	Marc Schneiderman	8738/1	3517

27614 7590 04/06/2005
MCCARTER & ENGLISH, LLP
FOUR GATEWAY CENTER
100 MULBERRY STREET
NEWARK, NJ 07102

EXAMINER

SHAH, NILESH R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2195

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/838,806	SCHNEIDERMAN, MARC	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nilesh Shah	2195	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/15/04.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21,25,26,28-34 and 38-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21,25,26,28-34 and 38-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-21,25,26,28-34 and 38-50 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-21,25,26,28-34 and 38-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reiffin (6,330,583) further in view of Jagannathan et al (6,496,871) (hereinafter Jagannathan)
4. As per claim 1, Reiffin teaches a method for providing parallel execution of computing tasks in a heterogeneous computing environment comprising:
partitioning a computing task into small tasks (col. 5 lines 52-60).
Reiffin does not specifically teach the use of mobile agents.

Jagannathan teaches assigning the small tasks to mobile agents determining available computing hosts in the heterogeneous computing environment transferring the mobile agents to the available computing hosts (col. 2 lines 59-67; col. 5 lines 57-67; col. 6 lines 1-19);

executing the mobile agents at the available computing hosts using execution code provided to the mobile agent from a central serve (col. 6 lines 61-67; col. 10 lines 47-64; col. 9 lines 1-12); and maintaining, at a second computer host at which none of the mobile agents are executing, stack trace and state information about each of the mobile agents to allow one or more of the mobile agents to be reconstructed in an alternate computer host using the stack trace and state information (col. 1 lines 9-15; col. 6 lines 33-45; col. 9 lines 1-11; col. 17 lines 1-14; col. 24 lines 22-64).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Jagannathan and Reiffin because Jagannathan's system of including mobile agents to distribute tasks through mobile agents would improve Reiffin's system by enhancing network mobility and communication.

5. As per claim 2, Jagannathan teaches a method wherein the step of determining available computing hosts further comprises determining network latency (col. 23 lines 25-57).
6. As per claim 3, Jagannathan teaches a method further comprising transferring execution code from a central server to virtual machines at the available computing hosts (60, fig 5; col. 12 lines 40 –63).

7. As per claim 4, Jagannathan teaches a method wherein the step of executing the mobile agents is performed in virtual machines at the computing hosts without modification of the virtual machines (col. 6 lines 61-67; col. 10 lines 47-64; col. 9 lines 1-12).
8. As per claim 5, Jagannathan teaches a method wherein one of the small tasks is assigned to one of the mobile agents (col. 24 lines 25-37; col. 26 lines 27-44).
9. As per claim 6, Jagannathan teaches a method wherein the step of transferring execution code is performed in response to a request by a mobile agent (col. 10 lines 47-64; col. 9 lines 1-12).
10. As per claim 7, Jagannathan teaches a method wherein the step of transferring execution code is performed by a web server (col. 23 lines 25-57).
11. As per claim 8, Jagannathan teaches a method further comprising monitoring execution of the mobile agents at the available computing hosts (col. 1 lines 9-15; col. 6 lines 33-45; col. 9 lines 1-11; col. 17 lines 1-14; col. 24 lines 22-64).
12. As per claim 9, Jagannathan teaches a method further comprising allowing the mobile agents to collaborate over the heterogeneous computing environment as the mobile agents execute at the available computing hosts (col. 9 lines 1-11; col. 17 lines 1-14; col. 24 lines 22-64).

13. As per claim 10, Jagannathan teaches a method wherein the mobile agents are executed in real time (col. 9 lines 32-41).

14. Claim 11 is rejected based on the same rejection for claim 1 above. In addition Jagannathan teaches storing stack trace and real-time state information about one or more the mobile agents at a first alternate computing host on which none of the one or more mobile agents are executing to allow the one or more mobile agents to be reconstructed at a second alternate computing host (col. 1 lines 9-15; col. 6 lines 33-45; col. 9 lines 1-11; col. 17 lines 1-14; col. 24 lines 22-64).

15. As per claim 12, Jagannathan teaches a method further comprising, prior to transferring the mobile agents, the steps of:
determining network latency affecting transmission of data between computing hosts (col. 23 lines 25-57); and
halting transferring of the mobile agents if network latency exceeds a threshold (col. 23 lines 25-57).

16. As per claim 13, Jagannathan teaches a method further comprising, prior to transferring the mobile agents, the steps of:
monitoring utilization of the computing hosts(col. 23 lines 25-57); and

halting transferring of the mobile agents if utilization of computing hosts exceeds a threshold (col. 23 lines 25-57).

17. As per claim 14, Reiffin method for providing parallel computing comprising:

breaking a computer task into small tasks(col. 5 lines 52-60).

Jagannathan teaches constructing an application using a plurality of mobile agents (col. 9 lines 1-11; col. 17 lines 1-14; col. 24 lines 22-64);

transferring the plurality of mobile agents to a first computing host (col. 2 lines 59-67; col. 5 lines 57-67; col. 6 lines 1-19);

executing the plurality of mobile agents at the first computing host (col. 6 lines 61-67; col. 10 lines 47-64; col. 9 lines 1-12);

maintaining, stack trace and state information about each of the mobile agents at a second computing host on which none of the plurality of mobile agents are executing (col. 1 lines 9-15; col. 6 lines 33-45; col. 9 lines 1-11; col. 17 lines 1-14; col. 24 lines 22-64).

migrating an application in a virtual machine from a primary host to a secondary host (col. 12 lines 27-39); and

detecting an indication to migrate the application in response to the indication, migrating the application from the primary host to the secondary host without modifying a virtual machine (col. 1 lines 9-15; col. 6 lines 33-45; col. 9 lines 1-11; col. 17 lines 1-14; col. 24 lines 22-64).

18. As per claim 15, Jagannathan teaches a method wherein the indication comprises an indication of network latency (col. 23 lines 25-57).
19. As per claim 16, Jagannathan teaches a method the indication comprises an indication of hostile attack (col. 23 lines 25-57).
20. As per claim 17, Jagannathan teaches a method wherein the hostile attack comprises hacking (col. 23 lines 25-57).
21. As per claim 18, Jagannathan teaches a method wherein the indication comprises an indication of network failure (col. 23 lines 25-57).
22. As per claim 19, Jagannathan teaches a method the indication comprises an indication of computer hardware failure (col. 23 lines 25-57).
23. As per claim 20, Jagannathan teaches a method further comprising resuming execution of the mobile agent at the secondary host where execution was halted (col. 1 lines 9-15; col. 6 lines 33-45; col. 9 lines 1-11; col. 17 lines 1-14; col. 24 lines 22-64).
24. As per claim 21, Jagannathan teaches a method wherein information about an executing thread of the mobile agent is existed at the first host prior to being transferred to the third computing host (col. 6 lines 61-67; col. 10 lines 47-64; col. 9 lines 1-12).

25. As per claim 25, Jagannathan teaches a method wherein further comprising:
continuing monitoring for another indication to migrate the application(col. 3 lines 30-42,
col. 13 lines 44-56);
continuing migrating the application to other hosts(col. 12 lines 27-39).
26. Claim 26 is rejected based on the same rejection for claim 11 above. In addition
Jagannathan teaches means for transferring execution code from a central server to the
computing resources, the computing resources receiving and executing one of the small
tasks assigned to a mobile agent in the virtual machines using the execution code and the
means for transferring execution code maintaining stack trace and state information about
each of the mobile agents at a first alternate computing host where none of the mobile
agents are executing to allow each of the mobile agents to be reconstructed at a second
alternate computing host (col. 6 lines 61-67; col. 10 lines 47-64; col. 9 lines 1-12).
27. As per claim 28, Jagannathan teaches an apparatus wherein the central server comprises a
web server (col. 23 lines 25-57).
28. As per claim 29, Jagannathan teaches an apparatus further comprising means for
monitoring execution of the small tasks (col. 24 lines 40-60).

29. As per claim 30, Jagannathan teaches an apparatus further comprising collaboration means for allowing the mobile agents to communicate and share information in real time (col. 9 lines 32-41).
30. As per claim 31, Jagannathan teaches an apparatus wherein the mobile agents execute in real time (col. 23 lines 25-57; col. 9 lines 32-41).
31. As per claim 32, Jagannathan teaches an apparatus further comprising storage means for storing real time state information about the mobile agents as the mobile agents execute at the computing resources (col. 9 lines 32-41; col. 6 lines 61-67; col. 10 lines 47-64; col. 9 lines 1-12).
32. As per claim 33, Jagannathan teaches an apparatus further comprising:
means for monitoring execution of the mobile agents at the computing hosts (col. 2 lines 59-67; col. 5 lines 57-67; col. 6 lines 1-19); and
means for detecting over-utilization of one of the computing hosts and for issuing a warning when one of the computing hosts is over-utilized (col. 23 lines 25-57).
33. Claim 34 is rejected based on the same rejection for claim 1 and 16 above. In addition Jagannathan teaches detecting an indication to migrate the mobile agent thread; and in response to the indication, stopping execution of the mobile agent thread; and transferring the information about the mobile agent thread to a second computing host

(col. 1 lines 9-15; col. 6 lines 33-45; col. 9 lines 1-11; col. 17 lines 1-14; col. 24 lines 22-64).

34. As per claim 38, Jagannathan teaches a further comprising:

receiving the stack trace and state information about the mobile agent thread at the third computing host(col. 18 lines 39-51); and

reconstructing the mobile agent thread at the third computing host using the stack and state information about the mobile agent thread and continuing processing of the mobile agent thread at the third computing host at a point at which execution of the thread was stopped at the first computing host (col. 2 lines 59-67; col. 5 lines 57-67; col. 6 lines 1-19).

35. As per claim 39, Jagannathan teaches a wherein the step of transferring the stack and state information about the mobile agent thread farther comprises serializing the information about the mobile agent thread (col. 2 lines 59-67; col. 5 lines 57-67; col. 6 lines 1-19; col. 1 lines 9-15; col. 6 lines 33-45; col. 9 lines 1-11).

36. Claim 40 is rejected based on the same rejection for claim 1 above. In addition

Jagannathan teaches agent collaboration environment, which comprises:

a plurality of mobile agents (col. 5 lines 57-67).

providing a virtual workspace for the mobile agents (col. 18 lines 39-51), and

a registration subsystem for selectively assigning the plurality of mobile agents

Art Unit: 2195

wherein each of the plurality of agents can share data, information(col. 9 lines 1-11; col. 17 lines 1-14; col. 24 lines 22-64).

37. As per claim 41, Jagannathan teaches an agent collaboration environment wherein the conference room monitors and moderates communication between the plurality of mobile agents (col. 18 lines 39-51; col. 2 lines 59-67; col. 5 lines 57-67).
38. Claim 42 is rejected based on the same rejected as claims 1 and 11 above.
39. Claim 43 is rejected based on the same rejected as claim 15 above.
40. Claim 44 is rejected based on the same rejected as claim 30 above.
41. Claim 45 is rejected based on the same rejected as claim 34 above.
42. Claim 46 is rejected based on the same rejected as claim 1 above.
43. Claims 47 and 48 are rejected based on the same rejected as claim 15 above.
44. Claims 49 and 50 are rejected based on the same rejected as claims 5 and 7 above.

Response to Arguments

45. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-50 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

46. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 2195

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nilesh Shah whose telephone number is (571)272-3771. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng An can be reached on (571)272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nilesh Shah
Examiner
Art Unit 2195



MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

NS
March 28, 2005